

Remarks

Claims 1-8 are pending in the application, with claims 1 and 5 being the independent claims.

Claims 1, 3 and 4 have been amended. Claim 1 has been amended with the features of claim 2, to specify that the washer is a flat ring, and to correct informalities. Support for the amendment specifying that the washer is a flat ring can be found, for example, in Figs. 1 and 3 and page 6, lines 2-4 of the originally filed specification. Claims 3 and 4 have been amended to remove the phrase "and the like."

Claim 2 has been canceled.

Claims 5-8 have been added. Support for new claims 5 and 6 can be found, for example, on page 1, lines 13-15. Support for new claim 7 can be found, for example, on page 3, lines 11-13. Support for new claim 8 can be found, for example, in Fig. 3.

The Specification has been amended to correct informalities. A Substitute Specification is attached hereto, including a Substitute Specification Showing Changes and a Substitute Specification with Changes Incorporated. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 2 has been canceled. Claims 1, 3 and 4 have been amended to remove "and the like" and to replace "adsorbing" and "adsorbed" with --adhering-- and --adhered--.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,953,970 to Maynard ("Maynard").

Maynard is directed to a mount for an optical system component and discloses an adapter ring 12 that connects a retaining ring 13 to a barrel ring 11 of the optical system. (Maynard, Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 34-39). The adapter ring 12 is mounted on the barrel ring 11 with a set screw 16. (Maynard,

Fig. 1 and col. 2, lines 41-43). The Office Action argues that the barrel ring 11 is analogous to the "washer" of claim 1, and the retaining ring is analogous to the "auxiliary-lens body" of claim 1.

Claim 1 recites "the washer is a flat ring." The adapter ring 12 of Maynard is not a flat ring. Maynard does not disclose or suggest that the adapter ring 12 can be flat. In fact, Maynard teaches away from such a modification in that if adapter ring 12 was flat, it could not be attached to the barrel ring 11 with the set screw 16. The transverse projection 15 of the adapter ring 12 performs a necessary function in Maynard. (Maynard, col. 2, lines 40-41).

Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Maynard because Maynard fails to disclose or suggest at least these features of claim 1. Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1 and are allowable as depending from an allowable claim.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Maynard. Claim 3 recites that the bonding agent is double-faced tape. The Office Action argues that double-faced tape is a well known bonding means for attaching elements and that one would have been motivated to so modify Maynard in order to magnetically attach auxiliary lenses to a camera that does not have a lens barrel structure on which to mount the disclosed magnetically permeable adapter ring 12. In that **Maynard fails to suggest or contemplate auxiliary lenses without a lens barrel structure**, there is no motivation to modify the apparatus of Maynard with double-faced tape.

Claim 3 is also allowable as depending from allowable claim 1.

New Claims 5-8

Claim 5 recites "the washer is a flat ring." This is in contrast to Maynard in which the adapter ring 12 is not a flat ring. Maynard does not disclose or suggest that the adapter ring 12 can be flat. In fact, Maynard teaches away from such a modification in that if adapter ring 12 was flat, it would not be able to attach to barrel ring 11 with the set screw 16. The transverse projection 15 of the adapter ring 12 performs a necessary function in Maynard. (Maynard, col. 2, lines 40-41).

Appl. No. 10/630,760
Amendment dated July 6, 2004
Reply to Office Action of April 9, 2004

Claim 6 recites that the apparatus includes at least one of a digital camera, a cellular phone with built-in camera, and a disposable camera. Maynard does not teach or suggest this feature.

Claim 7 recites that the bonding agent is an adhesive agent. This is in contrast to Maynard in which the "bonding agent" is a set screw 16.

Claim 8 recites that the washer is to be mounted directly on the camera. This is in contrast to Maynard in which the adapter ring 12 is mounted to ring 11, not the camera (not shown). In fact, Maynard teaches away from such an arrangement. In Maynard, the camera itself would not be adapted to receive set screw 16, which mounts the adapter ring 12 onto the barrel ring 11.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.


If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Appl. No. 10/630,760
Amendment dated July 6, 2004
Reply to Office Action of April 9, 2004

A Notice of Allowance with claims 1 and 3-8 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 07/06/04



Chad C. Anderson
Registration No. 44,505
VENABLE LLP
P.O. Box 34385
Washington, D.C. 20043-9998
Telephone: (202) 344-8257
Telefax: (202) 344-8300

DC2DOCS1\553852